## EXHIBIT 2

Pages 1 - 23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BEFORE MAGISTRATE JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY WAYMO, LLC, Plaintiff, ) No. C 17-00939 WHA (JSC) vs. UBER TECHNOLOGIES, LLC., OTTO TRUCKING, LLC, and OTTOMOTTO, LLC, ) San Francisco, California Defendants. Monday ) September 18, 2017 1:00 p.m. TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS **APPEARANCES:** For Plaintiff: QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART, OLIVER & Sullivan, LLP 50 California Street 22nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111 BY: DAVID ANDREW PERLSON, ESQ. CHARLES KRAMER VERHOEVEN, ESQ. JORDAN R. JAFFE, ESQ. MELISSA J. BAILY, ESQ. JEFFREY WILLIAM NARDINELLI, ESQ. For Defendants MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP 425 Market Street Uber and Ottomotto: San Francisco, California 94105 BY: ARTURO J. GONZALEZ, ESQ. (APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE) Reported By: Debra L. Pas, CSR 11916, CRR, RMR, RPR Official Reporter - US District Court

Computerized Transcription By Eclipse

```
1
          Is everyone in agreement with that?
 2
               MR. GONZALEZ:
                              That's fine, your Honor.
               THE COURT: Okay. All right.
 3
          Is there anything else then we should discuss?
 4
 5
               MR. GONZALEZ:
                              Have a safe trip.
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
 6
 7
                              I guess the only -- we have the review
               MS. BLUNSCHI:
     of the native devices on hold.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Oh, yes. Right. So what do you want to
     do with that? The review of the native?
10
11
               MR. PERLSON: We'll get our people in there to look
     at them and take them.
12
13
               THE COURT: But when? So you already have -- you
     have the documents at Uber.
14
15
               MR. PERLSON:
                             Right.
16
               THE COURT:
                           I mean, at MoFo, that no one is there
     looking at, right?
17
                             They are there looking.
18
               MR. PERLSON:
19
               THE COURT:
                           I thought they were at Stroz.
20
               MR. GONZALEZ:
                              No.
               THE COURT: What about the documents Mr. Gonzalez was
21
     talking about that Mr. Judah looked at, right?
22
23
               MR. PERLSON: Oh, those documents. Understood.
               THE COURT: So I --
24
               MR. PERLSON: Those aren't the native devices.
25
```

```
THE COURT: No, no, no. I understand. I'm just
 1
 2
    trying to figure out. The issue with the native devices was
     the privacy, right?
 3
 4
              MS. BLUNSCHI: Yes.
 5
              THE COURT: This is what I want you to do. I want
 6
    you to review the relativity first. I want you to review that.
 7
         I want you to take Mr. Friedberg's deposition, and then I
    want you to give me a -- and it may not be hard to do, but some
 8
    inkling why you have reason to believe what's on those native
 9
    is different from there. That's all. Just something. And I
10
11
    just don't think you can do that until you've done these other
    things first.
12
13
              MR. PERLSON: Understood, your Honor.
               THE COURT: All right. But they are there and they
14
15
     are ready to go.
16
               MS. BLUNSCHI:
                              It will probably take about 24 hours
17
     to get that set up in the review room, to have the native
18
     devices, you know, brought in, plugged in, things like that,
19
    but that can obviously be done.
20
               THE COURT: All right.
21
         Mr. Ehrlich?
               MR. EHRLICH: Just on the issue of the native
22
23
     devices.
              It's not just a privacy issue. It has all the
    privileged documents.
24
                          I know. And part of that is just going
25
               THE COURT:
```

```
to be why it's happening now with the relativity and some stuff
 1
     is just going to have to be clawed back. It just -- it is what
 2
     it is.
 3
               MR. EHRLICH: Understood.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: All right. And those other devices are
     being imaged now, correct?
 6
               MS. BLUNSCHI: The additional hundred that were not
 7
     part of the review are being imaged.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: Okay.
                              We would presume that those would
10
               MS. BLUNSCHI:
11
     probably follow, obviously, the native devices that are ready.
               MR. EHRLICH: And to the extent they weren't part of
12
     the Stroz review, it is hard to understand how in this case
13
     it's relevant to claims of what MoFo or Uber --
14
15
               THE COURT: That Uber, maybe. But Otto Trucking is
     also a defendant, right?
16
17
               MR. EHRLICH: Yes.
                                   So --
               THE COURT: And Otto Trucking is essentially
18
19
     Mr. Levandowski.
               MR. EHRLICH: Well, I'll let their counsel speak to
20
21
     that, but he's certainly an important part of it.
          But perhaps if they can make a showing of relevance there,
22
23
     it would justify the extraordinary amount of time that it would
     take to review 100 native devices, particularly if we have to
24
25
     be there to monitor --
```